IEEE 1904.2 UMT, D0.6, Approved Responses	Printed on 22 May 2020 at 6:41:31 AM
#6 Type: ER TE: TE2 Clause: 3.1 Page: 13 Line: 10 Commenter: Kevin & Noll / Tibit Co	ammunications
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: -	Similarications
"Faults Accounting Configuration Performance and Security (ECAPS)" should be "Fault Configuration Accounting	Performance, Security management (ECAPS)"
Change text to "Fault Configuration Accounting Performance Security management (ECAPS)"	
Change text to "Fault, Configuration, Accounting, Performance, Security (ECAPS) management"	
#7Type: ERTF: TF2Clause: 3.2Page: 13Line: 21Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Commenter: Kevin A	ommunications
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: -	
Faults, Accounting, Configuration, Performance, and Security should be "Fault, Configuration, Accounting, Performation	nce, Security management"
Change text to "Fault, Configuration, Accounting, Performance, Security management (FCAPS)"	
Change text to "Fault, Configuration, Accounting, Performance, Security (FCAPS)"	
#4 Type: TR TE: TE2 Clause: 6.1 Page: 15 Line: 14 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadc	om
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: -	
The layering diagram in Figure 4-1 and the interlayer interface definitions in Figure 4-2 were all updated to show UM	T client and OMCI client sitting on top of UMT sublaver. But
the block diagram in Figure 6-1 has not been updated.	······································
Modify the UMT sublayer block diagram as shown in tf2_2005_kramer_2.pdf.	
-	
	mmunications
#15 Type: TK TFZ Clause: 5.1 Page: 23 Line: 11 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Commenter: Set infection: Set infectinter: Set infectint	ommunications
Comment status: Resolved Response status: AIP Commenter satisfaction: satisfied Category: -	
The sentence "Note that the destination device may not be UNIT-aware and the UNIT tunnel may be terminated ber	bre the frame reaches that device" is confusing.
station identified by the DestinationAddress'	tunnel be terminated before the UMTPDU reaches the
field, but rather just an additional explanation. Replace existing text "Note that the destination device may not be U the frame reaches that device." with " <new line=""> NOTE The station identified by <i>DestinationAddress</i> might not be before the UMTPDU reaches that station."</new>	JMT-aware and the UMT tunnel may be terminated before UMT-aware, in which case the UMT tunnel is terminated
#16 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.1 Page: 23 Line: 15 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Co	ommunications
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: -	
The sentence "Note that the source device may not be UMT aware and the UMT tunnel may be originated after the	frame leaves that device" is confusing.
Reword "The station identified by SourceAddress might not be UMT-aware which would require that the UMT tunne identified by the DestinationAddress"	el be terminated before the UMTPDU reaches the station
Comment is actually technical in nature. Type changed to TR The proposed remedy confuses the source and the des "Note" is needed, because this sentence is not part of the definition of the SourceAddress field, but rather just an ac source device may not be UMT aware and the UMT tunnel may be originated after the frame leaves that device." wi <i>SourceAddress</i> might not be UMT-aware, in which case the UMT tunnel is initiated after the xPDU leaves that station	tination devices. Also, the same issues as in comment #15. Iditional explanation. Replace existing text "Note that the th " <new line=""> NOTE The station identified by "</new>
#17 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 5.1 Page: 23 Line: 27 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Co	ommunications
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: -	
Reference to 802.3 is in green text.	
Change text color to black	
-	
#8 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2 Page: 24 Line: 6 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Commenter: Kevin A. Noll	ommunications
Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -	
Table 5-1 shows OMCI_Subtype as 0x04. Current implementations of the draft are using 0x0C.	
Designate OMCI_Subtype as 0x0C	
Comment withdrawn on 2020.05.18, at 13:34	
#5 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2 Page: 24 Line: 7 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadc	om
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: -	
Action item taken at the last meeting to align two organization-specific UMTPDU subtypes with two OUI types (24-bi	t and 36-bit).
1) Remove the editorial note on page 24. 2) Modify table 5-1 as shown in tf2_2005_kramer_3.pdf 3) Modify subclauk kramer 4.pdf is a clean version of the proposed changes.	use 5.2.6 as shown in tf2_2005_kramer_3.pdf File tf2_2005

Changes per tf2_2005_kramer_3.pdf comment plus: - change "5.2.6 Organization-specific extension subtype" to "5.2.6 Organization-specific extension subtypes"							
#21 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2.1 Page: 24 Line: 11 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications							
Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -							
Subclause 5.2.1 refers to UMTPDUs with subtype 0x00 as UMT_CONFIG, but no other UMTPDU subtype is given a "special" name.							
Assign "special" name to each UMTPDU subtype and use as needed in the text.							

#14Type: TRTF: TF2Clause: 6Page: 26Line: 10Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit CommunicationsComment Status: Withdraw Response Status: NoneCommenter Satisfaction: NoneCategory: -							
There is no specification for how to forward a frame to the proper entity after rules are processed. All of the text and diagrams (see Fig 6-1) seem to assume that the resulting frame will go to UMTSI:MA_DATA.indication or MACCSI:MA_DATA.request. This would not be true for UMT Client PDUs and for OMCI frames destined to the OMCI client.							
There is no specification for how to forward a frame to the proper entity after rules are processed. All of the text and diagrams (see Fig 6-1) seem to assume that the resulting frame will go to UMTSI:MA_DATA.indication or MACCSI:MA_DATA.request. This would not be true for UMT Client PDUs and for OMCI frames destined to the OMCI client.							
There is no specification for how to forward a frame to the proper entity after rules are processed. All of the text and diagrams (see Fig 6-1) seem to assume that the resulting frame will go to UMTSI:MA_DATA.indication or MACCSI:MA_DATA.request. This would not be true for UMT Client PDUs and for OMCI frames destined to the OMCI client. Add text and attributes to allow a rule to specify the primitives. See tf2_2005_d_06_rule_processing_noll_1							

IEEE 1904.2 UMT, D0.6, Approved Responses	Printed on 22 May 2020 at 6:41:32	2 AM					
	age: 26 Line: 10 Commenter: Kevin & Noll / Tibit Communications						
Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None	ommenter Satisfaction: None Category: -						
The text in clause 6 says that there are two CTE instances -	one transmit and one receive. There is no way for the UMT configuration protocol to specify which path a rule						
should be applied.							
Add a field in the UMT config PDU that specifies the directio _rule_processing_noll_1	on to apply the rule. Alternatively, change the text to indicate that there is only one CTE instance. See tf2_2005_d	J_06					
Per proposal but with following changes: - 0x020 should be added. **********************************	e 0x02 - Table_Spec should be TableSpec Also, it seems Length field should be L+6 now that 2 extra octets were .21, at 17:48						
#11 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6 Pa	age: 29 Line: - Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications						
Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None	ommenter Satisfaction: None Category: -						
Is it possible to have more than one rule in place at a time? example, what happenes if an incoming frame matches mo	If so, then it is possible that a frame could match more than one rule. How does the UMT CTE resolve conflicts? F re than one rule?	For					
Add a priority field to the CTE rule structure and specify how the NMS to configure the CTE such that there is never a pos	w rules are to be processed. See tf2_2005_d_06_rule_processing_noll_1. Alternatively, add language that require ssibility that more than one rule could match.	es					
Per proposal but with following changes: - 0x020 should be added. **********************************	e 0x02 - Table_Spec should be TableSpec Also, it seems Length field should be L+6 now that 2 extra octets were .21, at 18:02						
	and 20 Lines 15 Commonton Kovin A Nell / Tikit Communications						
#20 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1 Pice Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP Comment Status: AIP Co	age: 29 Line: 15 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications						
Figure 6-1 shows the interface from OAM Sublayer to UMT	Sublayer using MA_DATA primitives. It does not show the primitives to the OMCI client as depicted in figure 4-2.						
Submitted diagram							
See comment #4							
#9 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1 Pa	age: 29 Line: 20 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications						
Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None Co	ommenter Satisfaction: None Category: -						
The rule syntax described here is not used anywhere else in	n the document. Is it necessary?						
Adopt the format used in 1904.1 clause / (e.g. Table /-6, et	C).						
riease suggest specific changes. This is really a technical of	comment. Type changed to TK						
#12 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1.2 Pa	age: 30 Line: - Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications						
Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None Co	ommenter Satisfaction: None Category: -						
Currently the text implies that classification fields allow only	y exact matches. What if an implementer wishes to match a range of, for exampe all Multicast, or all of a given O	UI?					
Add field codes that allow ranges or masks. See tf2_2005_d0_6_mask_matching_noll_1							
**************************************	3:33						
#10 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1.2 Pa	age: 30 Line: 18 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications						
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP Co	ommenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: -						
Table 6-2 is labeled as "L2 classification fields". This is confu	using as the table contains classification fields for an L2 subtype payload as well as for the UMT header fields.						
Rename the table to "Classification fields" or split the table	to "UMT classification fields" and "L2 subtype classification fields". I favor the latter.						
Rename the table to "Classification fields"							
#19 Type: TP TE: TE2 Clause: 6.1.1.1.2 D	age: 20 Line: 18 Commenter: Kevin & Noll / Tibit Communications						
Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None	ommenter Satisfaction: None Category: -						
Table 6-2 uses DST_ADDR and SRC_ADDR. This is not consis	stent with 1904.1						
CHANGE "DST_ADDR" and "SRC_ADDR" to "DA" and "SA", r	respectively in Table 6-2 and throughout the uses in the text.						
Comment is technical in nature. Type was changed to TR TI	his was done deliberately, to distinguish three separate concepts: (1) a field code DEST ADDR (which is an 8-bit						
constant with a value of 0x01), (2) a field name <i>Destination</i>	Address (which is a 48-bit EUI-48 value), and (3) references to an actual thing called the destination address (with 020.05.21, at 18:07	•					
connent withdrawn on z							
#18 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1.2 Pa	age: 32 Line: 4 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications						
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP Co	ommenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: -						
Table 6-3 specifies a "DELETE" and a "CHANGE" action. This	is not consistent with how 1904.1 describes classification and actions.						
Commont is tochnical in nature. Type was charged to TRE	E" In Table 6-3 and througout the uses in the text.						
"Change (replace) a field" to "Replace (change) a field"	iobal replace is needed. Also make the following changes - Delete (remove) a field to Remove (delete) a field.	-					

#1 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 7.1 Page: 40 Line: 14 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: -

In table 7-2, the the description for the Direction field incorrectly states that a rule for transmit path is an ingress rule and the rule for the receive path is an egress rules.

Swap the words "ingress" and "egress"

#3 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 7.2 Page: 41 Line: 1 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: -

By allowing a field mask to be used in CTE rule conditions, we can eliminate the field codes for fields that are sub-fields of other defined fields, e.g., VLAN0_TPID, VLAN1_VID, etc.

1) Add a Mask component to CTE rule TLV structure as shown in tf2_2005_kramer_5.pdf 2) Delete unnecessary field codes from table 6-2 and renumber the remaining codes as shown in tf2_2005_kramer_6.pdf.

#2	Type: T	TF: TF2	Clause: 7A.1	Page: 44	Line: 4	Commenter: Gle	n Kramer / Broadcom	
Comme	nt Status: Re	solved R	esponse Status: Accept	Commenter S	atisfactio	n: None	Category: -	
Annex 7	A is empty							

1) Add an example of OAM over UMT as shown in tf2_2005_kramer_1.pdf 2) Add field code for XPDU_SUBTYPE with value 0x26 as shown in tf2_2005_kramer_6.pdf

Page 3 of 3